

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

SAMUEL BAILEY, et al.,

Plaintiff(s),

V.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:21-cv-00977-JCM-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 6]

Pending before the Court is the parties' proposed discovery plan seeking special scheduling. Docket No. 6. For the reasons discussed below, the discovery plan is **DENIED** without notice.

When special scheduling review is requested, the discovery plan must provide “a statement of the reasons why longer or different periods should apply to the case.” Local Rule 26-1(a). No reasons have been provided in the discovery plan for the special deadlines being sought.

Moreover, initial disclosures are generally due “at or within 14 days after the parties’ Rule 26(f) conference.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(C). Although the discovery plan does not identify the date of the Rule 26(f) conference, it seeks an initial disclosure deadline of roughly two months from now. *See* Docket No. 6 at 1. The only justification for that request for a lengthy extension is an unelaborated assertion that it is sought “to accommodate Plaintiff’s schedule and business-related travel.” *Id.* The Court is not persuaded that such a lengthy extension is justified based on that bald assertion.

Lastly, the discovery plan violates the local rules by providing a signature block for the Court's approval on a separate page. *Compare* Docket No. 6 at 3 with Local Rule IA 6-2.

1 In light of the above, the discovery plan is **DENIED** without prejudice. An amended
2 discovery plan must be filed by September 23, 2021.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: September 16, 2021

Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge